1986

Early childhood professionals' perception of their occupational worth

Pauline Davey Zeece
Iowa State University

Zeece, Pauline Davey

EARLY CHILDHOOD PROFESSIONALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OCCUPATIONAL WORTH

Iowa State University PH.D. 1986

Early childhood professionals' perception of their occupational worth

by

Pauline Davey Zeece

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
Major: Child Development

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Theoretical Background

Today early childhood professionals comprise a widely diversified occupational group ranging from family day care providers and day care center staff members to nursery school teachers and Head Start staff members. The common denominator among these professionals has been their gender, in most cases, and their involvement with young children. The latest available statistics from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1979) indicated that 98.1% of the total employed child care workers and 96.5% of the total employed pre-kindergarten teachers in the United States were female.

Scarr et al. (1986) suggested that socialization made female children appropriately feminine, as prescribed by the culture. Learning to become a member of the culture included understanding whether one's self was either male or female. This learning also involved the development of culturally appropriate and approved perceptions about occupations. Slaby and Frey (1975) found that in childhood females developed a gender identity or inner sense of themselves as females. Young girls first mastered gender identity or correct labeling of their own gender around the age of three years (Huston, 1983; Thompson, 1975).

As children progressed toward the cognitive stage of concrete operational thought, they began to understand that gender was not changed over time (DeVries, 1969; Marcus &

Overton, 1978; McConaghy, 1979), altered by transformations in appearance or activities (Kohlberg, 1966), or changed by wishing (Scarr et al., 1986). According to Marcus and Overton, school-age females constructed their own definitions of gender which included, among many other things, societal sex stereotypes and roles.

Barry and colleagues (1957) proposed that sex role differentiation was universal. In a cross-cultural study of 110 societies, it was found that girls and boys were trained to develop different occupational roles in virtually all societies. Huston (1983) suggested in her comprehensive review of the sex-typing literature that awareness of these sex stereotypes increased with age. Females learned that jobs, occupations, and roles were either masculine or feminine (Huston). Traditionally socialized females were taught roles of wife and mother. They learned that domestic roles superseded occupational ones (Aneshensel & Rosen, 1980; Russo, 1976). Expectations were channeled into occupations in which these anticipated accommodations to domestic roles were feasible options (Aneshensel & Rosen).

Huston (1983) reported that during middle childhood, awareness of societal stereotypes continued to increase monotonically with age. Stein (1971) found that older children's definitions of masculine or feminine activities increasingly corresponded to adult stereotypes. Acceptance of societal stereotypes as immutable declined during

elementary and adolescent years (Huston). Preference for gender-related activities followed different developmental paths. For instance, males exhibited an increase in preference for same sex activities, but girls did not (Blakemore et al., 1979). In fact, during the elementary school years, girls actually declined in their preference for feminine activities (Huston). However, by late adolescence, young females again expressed preference for female activities and occupational choices (Stein).

Sociological and psychological inquiry in the later twentieth century included such foci as the socialization of women, the general roles of "working women" and the specific roles of teaching and caregiving professionals. At the turn of the century, nearly half of America's women lived on farms. Eccles and Hoffman (1984) observed that these women were not counted in statistics on labor market participation unless they were household heads. Females who worked outside the home and were included in the census data concentrated primarily in three occupations: domestic service, factory work, and school teaching (Hayghe, 1976). Bernard (1981) suggested that current census data were not reflective of the occupation "housewife" and thereby excluded slightly more than one-half of all females (51.8%) in typical occupational summaries (Bernard, 1981). This exclusion suggested a subtle non-occupational value status for work performed inside the home, especially work typically identified with homemaking.

According to Hoffman (1984), substantial changes in women's labor market participation gradually were evidenced by an increasing number of women working for pay outside the home and a broadening variety of occupational openings available to them. Whitebook (1984) posited that one of the newest occupations to emerge was the caring for pay for relative and non-relative children of intact families outside the home. It was estimated by Lehrer (1983) and the U.S. Department of Labor (1980) that over 30 million children had mothers in the labor force, more than seven million of these children were under the age of six, and by 1990 the latter figure would be exceeded by 10 million. Thus, in the years to come many children of working parents would be cared for outside their own homes and become the responsibility of early childhood professionals.

Whitebook (1984) further suggested occupations within the early childhood profession had roots linked to three major traditions: kindergarten, day nursery, and nursery school. Each tradition exhibited unique philosophical and professional orientations and initially served different populations. Osborn (1975) noted the heritage of different occupations within the early childhood profession was also steeped in several social institutions including the school or educational system and the family. Most preschool and Head Start programs evolved from the educational model; most day care programs provided for needs formerly met by the

family. Effects of such diversity on early childhood professionals have not been demonstrated. It was not apparent in the literature if these professionals attributed more prestige or higher occupational worth to different occupations within the early childhood profession.

Based on the number of families using early childhood professionals for childcare and the diversity of philosophical and professional orientations of personnel in nursery school, day care and Head Start programs, it was logical to ask if early childhood professionals exhibited distinct attitudes about the value of their jobs. The answer to the question was not known. Therefore there was a need for investigation of early childhood professionals' perception of occupational worth of self and others, as well as an examination of career pattern profiles. Results of the investigation may help to define the profession and focus goals for future professional awareness at all levels.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate early childhood professionals' perceptions of their own and their peers occupational worth within their own and other occupations. It descriptively examined career patterns of early childhood workers in family day care, group day care, day care center, nursery school and Head Start programs. Perceptions of one's reference groups' perceptions (self,

significant other, child, mother, father, child client, parent client, society) were also analyzed.

Null Hypotheses

1. There are no statistically significant differences between the five respective groups (family day care home provider, group day care home provider, day care center teacher, nursery school teacher, and Head Start teacher) in their rank ordering of their respective groups relating to job pay, job status, and job value on the Occupational Worth Inventory (OWI).
2. There are no statistically significant differences between the five respective groups in their occupational ratings on the OWI.

Operational Definitions

For purposes of this study the following terms were operationally defined and were applicable to female early childhood workers in this study.

1. Early childhood profession: This term referred collectively to the following occupations: family day care provider, group day care provider, day care center provider, nursery school teacher, Head Start teacher.
2. Family day care provider: This term referred to the adult who cared for seven or fewer children (including her own under six years of age) in her own home for pay.

3. Group day care provider: This term referred to the adult who with an adult assistant cared for eight to 11 children in a home-like setting for pay.

4. Day care center provider: This term referred to the adult who cared for children on a regular basis in a center-based setting for pay.

5. Nursery school teacher: This term referred to the adult who cared for children for half-days or less in a center-based setting for pay.

6. Head Start teacher: This term referred to the adult who cared for children within a structured setting as dictated by Head Start Program Guidelines for pay.

7. Early childhood occupation: This term referred to any of the following: day care home provider, group day care home provider, day care center teacher, nursery school teacher, Head Start teacher.

8. Group: This term referred to the five early childhood occupations studied in this project.

9. Score: This term referred to the numerical average of perceived job value ratings on eight sources including self, significant other, child, mother, father, child client, parent client and society.

10. Male occupation: This term referred to jobs which are performed in this country 65% of the time or more by males, chosen from census data for use in the OWI.

11. Female occupation: This term referred to jobs which are

performed in this country 65% of the time or more by females, chosen from census data for use in the OWI.

12. Early childhood worker: This term referred to three occupations from the female occupation list including child care worker, preschool teacher, kindergarten teacher.

13. Teacher occupation: This term referred to three occupations from the female occupation list including preschool, kindergarten, and elementary teacher.

14. Occupational worth: This term referred to the value placed on one's early childhood occupation as measured by the Occupational Worth Inventory (OWI).

15. Occupational Worth Inventory (OWI): The OWI was an assessment instrument developed specifically for this dissertation. It contained sections on background information, job characteristics, and job values. The OWI is located in Appendix A.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The value placed on occupational worth by early childhood professionals was tied indirectly to several areas within the literature including socialization of women and women and work. From the socialization of women literature, gender identification and constancy, as well as sex role development were reviewed for this study. The women and work literature encompassed a historical overview, career choices, career expectations and preferences, career pattern profiles, and occupational value and social status.

Socialization of Women

The differences between the male and female were well documented in the social science literature by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). Hoffman (1977, 1984) proposed historical sex differences in socialization patterns. She found traditional expectations that girls would grow up to be mothers and care for children and boys would grow up to be primary wage earners. More recently Hoffman (1984) noted another trend. Increased female employment across the life span, decreased family size, and decreased percentage of adult years devoted to active mothering have begun to be detected. However, the effects of these changes have not been clearly documented in the literature.

Gender Identification and Constancy

From the moment of birth, gender effected children's interaction with the world (Clarke-Stewart & Fein, 1983). Scarr et al. (1986) theorized that socialization dictated appropriate femininity by conveying standards for female thinking, feeling, behaving and job execution. Correct identification of gender was a fundamental task in learning to become a female member of the culture. Gender identification was a prerequisite for learning culturally typical occupations.

In their comprehensive monograph on life-span development, Money and Ehrhardt (1972) reported that by age two, most children internalized a notion of gender as part of their identity. Slaby and Frey (1975) suggested that between ages two and three, girls labeled themselves correctly and classified themselves with others of the same gender. Huston (1983) posited that by age four or five children manifested stereotypic occupational preferences and expectations wherein girls expected to become nurses, teachers, and secretaries.

It took considerably longer for young children to develop gender constancy or the ability to recognize that gender was a constant trait. Once children understood gender constancy, they began planning for a lifetime as a male or female. McConaghy (1979) reported the acquisition of a developmentally predictable gender constancy sequence.

Young females first comprehended wishes were not determinents of gender. They then discovered gender remained constant for everyone across time. Finally, they learned that actions and alterations of physical appearance were not affected by gender.

In summary, female socialization in this culture was found to be on-going and predictable. Girls knew they were female early in their lives. They learned in a short time that they would remain female across their lifespans. Finally, girls learned that gender dictated which jobs were typically performed by females in the culture.

Sex Role Development

Barry and colleagues (1957) reported sex role differentiation existed in all cultures. Cross-cultural studies showed all societies viewed males and females differently in socially significant ways (Scarr et al., 1986). Block (1973, 1983) noted that specific tasks were assigned differently to men and women and proposed that male work was most often regarded as more valuable than female work. She reviewed studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s of differences in parental socialization of sons and daughters and found differences in sex role socialization according to the sex of parents and children. Block concluded that differences intensified with age despite parental, social, educational and cultural

backgrounds. These conclusions suggested that young females were encouraged less than young males to achieve, compete, and act independently. Fathers encouraged expressiveness and dependence in their daughters; mothers supervised daughters more strictly. Generally, girls were socialized as nurturant, obedient, responsible, unselfish and kind individuals (Barry et al., 1957; Hoffman, 1972). Personality traits that appeared to be suitable for success in early childhood occupations, but not necessarily in the traditional business world, were encouraged.

Ruble and Ruble (1980) reviewed in depth the literature on sex stereotypes about children. Toys, clothing, household objects, games, and work choices were stereotypicaly feminine for girls. Kuhn, Nash and Brucken (1978) found that two to three year olds showed only slightly better-than-chance responses to questions about sex role stereotypes. Other studies concluded that by age three, children's responses were predominantly stereotypic (Blakemore et al., 1979; Carter & Patterson, 1979; Edelbrock & Sugawara, 1978). Blakemore et al. reported that children's preferences followed dissimilar developmental paths, whereby values were attached at different ages to sex-typed roles. Female preferences for feminine activities increased until age five or six years (Blakemore et al.), decreased through the school-age and adolescent years (Huston-Stein & Higgins-Trenk, 1978), and

increased again in late adolescence where preferences appeared to be stable and stereotypic.

Several researchers suggested that changes in socialization promoted conflicting and non-normative beliefs about the roles women played in contemporary society (Gove, 1972; Gove & Tudor, 1973; Krause, 1983). Bernard (1981) theorized that a substantial degree of shaping connected to the role of mother was still taking place. She suggested that mothering was the norm for most adult females in this culture. Gove and Tudor (1973) proposed that a decline in the prestige assigned to homemaking contributed to greater dissatisfaction with housework and other related tasks. The value of these traditional roles was not easily specified. The effects of these sociological phenomena on the perceptions of occupational worth of women whose work outside the home encompassed many traditional female roles was not determined.

Whitebook (1984) suggested that girls were socialized to develop skills and attitudes that aided in the maintenance of a family. Interpersonal skills and an accommodative style were thought to increase the chance of competency in marriage and motherhood. These were not always complementary to the needs of the business world. Yet when women pursued early childhood occupations, they entered a working world which required many of the

traditional skills of motherhood and the contemporary skills of business life.

If, in fact, there were changes in socialization patterns for females, it would seem to follow that these changes impacted on early childhood professionals' occupational attitudes and choices. The women's movement of the past ten to fifteen years enhanced female employment possibilities in non-traditional positions. Yet, recent census statistics suggested that women still dominated the traditional positions within the early childhood education profession (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). According to Huyck and Hoyer (1982), the vast majority of female workers today were raised in a social system where career achievement was uncommon. They were socialized as young women during a time when female career advancement was unusual. Careers which encompassed roles of mother and business woman were a logical selection for the contemporary female worker population.

In summary, current theory on the socialization of females suggested that traditional expectations for female roles existed, but were changing gradually, as young females developed feminine gender identity and constancy. Females showed awareness and preference for stereotypically female toys, clothing, household objects, games and occupational choices. Effects of increasing numbers of female work force participants on socialization and sex

role development were not clear.

Women and Work

Over two decades ago Baker (1964) commented upon a paucity of research studies on women's contributions throughout history as workers inside and outside the home. To date, no empirical investigation of female early childhood professionals' perceptions of occupational worth was reported in the literature. This section of literature review focused on four themes related to working women. The first encompassed an historical overview. The second illustrated the concept of career choices. The third elucidated career preferences. The final section examined occupational values.

Historical Overview

According to Wertz (1982), research on female workers began around 1870 with the establishment of state labor bureaus. This initial research appeared to be overtly slanted. Female employment outside the home was regarded as a social problem and a threat to motherhood. The first landmark monographs on female workers were Clarke's (1873) Sex in Education and Ames' (1874) Sex in Industry. Ames suggested women's bodies were capable of serial, not simultaneous activity, due to limited energy levels. It was believed that excessive brainwork (e.g., work required

in professional employment) could "permanently damage a women's reproductive organs and nervous system by diverting too much blood from developing ovaries" (p. 162) (Wertz, 1982). Clarke made similar observations about female factory workers.

During this era it was also believed that the mixing of men and women in factories led to illicit sex and prostitution. Little differentiation was made between female factory workers and prostitutes. In 1884, the Massaschusetts Labor Commissioner (MLC) published results from a survey of female factory workers and prostitutes. With findings that indicated little or no reported sexual activities between factory workers, the MLC survey vindicated the good reputations of female factory workers (Pivar, 1973). In the early 1900s, a Senate investigation again studied female factory worker and issued a report which called for protective legislation prohibiting nightwork for women. This study concluded that women were best suited for working in the home (Branders & Goldmark, 1918). By the turn of the century, a new era of research on women's roles and a new breed of researchers emerged. These researchers, predominantly unmarried women, lived in settlement houses in urban areas where they collected data on female worklife.

Wertz (1982) suggested that studies of this early era espoused three basic assumptions. Occupational segregation

occurred because it was believed that females were temporary workers. Lower wages were not questioned because female labor was viewed as unskilled. Women were mothers first and workers second. Thus, the job of mother and the duties associated with it did not have job value as true employment or paid work.

After 1925, research on blue collar and most other female workers decreased. The only continuing research was in the area of occupational health. Oliver (1916) argued that women were more susceptible to industrial poisoning. Hamilton (1929) concluded that women were susceptible to occupational hazards, but cautioned that occupational segregation made it difficult to make comparisons. She argued that data were not comparable.

Little else on female workers was found in the social science literature until the early 1950s. In 1950, the research focused on professional and white-collar workers. The change of emphasis was attributed to improved industrial conditions, decreased reproductive disorders of women linked to their factory work, and changed attitudes toward female workers (Wertz, 1982).

The current increasing participation of women in the labor force was one of the best documented trends in women's studies (Bernard, 1981). Female labor force participation increased phenomenally after 1940 (Smith, 1979). In 1940 the participation rate was 29.9%.

Garfinkle (1969) reported that women averaged 33 years in the labor force in 1960, compared to the 11 years averaged in 1911. The projected rate of female labor force participation for 1990 was 68.3% (Bernard).

Until recently, custom prescribed that women changed upon their marriage whatever occupation they were engaged in to that of housekeeper, wife, and mother. In 1973, for the first time in history, the proportion of married women under 30 years of age who were working outside the home was more than half (52.9%) (Bernard, 1981). The overwhelming majority of these women had children (Bryson & Bryson, 1978; Hoffman, 1977).

The new patterns of increased labor market participation by women outside the home, increased longevity within the labor market outside the home, and increased numbers of working mothers created an interesting social paradox. Until recent times, the care and teaching of young children was culturally and occupationally provided for primarily within two feminine roles: mother and teacher (Bernard, 1981). The job of housewife and caregiver of children remained distinctive compared to other jobs. No clearly defined and widely understood standards for job performance were available for these occupations. No widely accepted monetary value was placed on services performed within these jobs. Huyck and Hoyer (1982) hypothesized that these limitations may contributed

to difficulty in experiencing a sense of satisfaction from having done a good job as a housewife or caregiver of children. Certainly there appeared to be little measure for excellence and little money to reward competence for similar roles performed within early childhood occupations.

In summary, the primary and exclusive roles of women, as wife and mother, changed as females entered the professional world. Some women left or supplemented primary roles of housewife and caregiver with professional employment outside the home. When these workers have children, they most often leave them with another professional - the early childhood worker.

Career Choices

Within the literature, career choice was influenced by several factors. Featherman and Hauser (1974) contended that perceived differences in job opportunities, perceived gender-related job restrictions, marital status, age and social convention influenced career decisions for females. McClendon (1979) found girls persuaded themselves that high career aspirations were unrealistic. They did not believe that there was a wide variety of career opportunities available to them.

Career choices were also influenced by perceived gender-related job restrictions. The fact that women tended to cluster in low-status, low-paying occupations

traditionally assigned to their sex has been well documented (Bloxall & Reagan, 1978; Featherman & Hauser, 1974; Selkow, 1984). Danzier (1983) posited that normatively males were expected to be economically independent, work all their lives, and be principal wage earners for the family. Females were expected to view the pursuit of career outside the home and economic independence as secondary.

Career choice also partially depended on marital status, age, and income (Piotrkowski & Crits-Christoph, 1981). Most early prewar female labor participation was attributed to older women who had completed the child-rearing phase of their life cycles (Rudd & McKenry, 1980). Recent female labor participation also included mothers under 35 years of age. Rudd and McKenry reported (1980) that in 1955, nearly half the women (46%) ages 20 to 24 years of age were labor force participants. By 1960, the number had fallen to only 36%, but it rose again to 50% by 1970. This participation rate was not changed substantially by 1975 (Rudd & McKenry). It appeared that, in general, women were staying in the work force longer. It was not known if this was true for early childhood professionals. Predictions of longevity within an occupation might be used as an informal index of professional attitude toward an occupation.

Finally, career choice was linked within the

literature to formal education. Occupational sex-role typing was found at all age levels in studies of students in preschool (Getty & Cahn, 1981; Jennings, 1975; Papalia & Tennent, 1975), elementary school (Hawkes, 1973; Looft, 1971a; Siegel, 1973), high school (Barnett, 1975; Bogie, 1976; Marini, 1978), and college (Epstein & Broncraft, 1978; Tangri, 1972). Females learned early and remembered long that career choice was relatively sex restricted. They began planning for stereotypic occupations at early ages. Very early in their schooling, children expressed stereotypic notions about career choices. In his first study, Looft (1971a) examined vocational role choices among 41 second-grade girls. These children uniformly nominated traditional vocations (e.g., mother, teacher) socially identified as female. A minimal variety of vocations was nominated. Only eight different careers were mentioned.

In a second study, Looft (1971b) included male and female first- and second-grade children. Eighteen different vocations were nominated by males; eight by females. Looft concluded that female children recognized traditional sex role expectations in regard to vocational roles. Young subjects reflected this recognition in the type and number of vocations they nominated as appropriate for females. Second-grade females overwhelmingly nominated traditional vocations. It has been similarly reported that female high schoolers aspired predominantly to the feminine

occupations of teaching, nursing, secretarial and clerical jobs and social work (Tangri, 1972; Barnett, 1975).

In summary, research has shown that career choice was influenced by perceived differences in job opportunities, gender-related job restrictions, marital status and education. Children received messages from society that career choices were governed, if not restricted, by gender.

Career Preference and Expectation

Huyck and Hoyer (1982) differentiated between career preference and career expectation. Career preference was defined as the preferred career, while career expectation implied a socially acceptable female career. These were not always mutually exclusive. For example, a woman may prefer to be an engineer, but expect to be a housewife and mother. Using data from the National Longitudinal Studies of High School Class of 1972, Daymont and Andresani (1984) concluded that there were gender differences in occupational preferences of adolescents and young adults. Young males reported high salaries were more important in job selection than same age females. Male workers indicated preferences for jobs where opportunity for leadership and power was present. Female workers expressed initial preferences for similar kinds of jobs, but ultimately selected occupations wherein helpfulness and ability to work with people was valued.

In summary, career choice was influenced by gender-related job restrictions, and life-cycle variables such as age, marital status, education, and income. It was assumed female early childhood professionals, as members of the work force, were influenced by these same things.

Career Pattern Profile

Rexroat (1985) estimated the work history of women in the National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market Experiences of Young Women. The work expectations of women were viewed within a life-course perspective. This life-span approach encompassed changes over women's lives as influenced by historical conditions. The study assumed every woman had multiple careers structured by historical circumstances and reflected in individualistic expectations, commitments, and resources. Though most conclusions were based upon female midlife employment data, the findings suggested that lifespan plans had substantial influence on labor force behavior. Women who planned to stay at home in the roles of wife and/or mother entered the labor market later, or less often, than women who worked outside the home. The literature has not reflected the career profile of workers who chose jobs, such as the early childhood occupations studied within this project, wherein roles and duties of homemaker and mother have been incorporated into jobs within the business world.

Super (1957) proposed one of the broadest and most widely accepted theories of vocational development. Accordingly, a worker developed and implemented a work self-concept. This guided a female worker through career experiences in a series of stages. Using the general theoretical framework of Super, Zaccaria (1970) identified seven female career pattern profiles. The profiles defined a sequence of events leading to (1) stable homemaking which included school to marriage to no work outside the home, (2) conventional working which included school to brief work experience to marriage, (3) stable working which included school to stable job for the remainder of life, (4) double tracking which included school to work to marriage to homemaking, (5) interrupted working which included school to work to child rearing to return to work, (6) unstable working which included school followed by an unpredictable sequence of work, marriage, childrearing, etc., and (7) multiple trial working which included school to a series of unrelated trial jobs with no genuine vocation. Clearly, some of these patterns were more career-oriented than others.

Karp and Yoels (1985) hypothesized that collective definitions and shared meanings were given to occupational careers. These were derived from general expectations of society. Proposed were broad stages of working life for all occupations which included (1) preparation and

exploration, (2) learning the ropes, (3) coming to grips, (4) settling in, and (5) exiting. It was not evident in the literature how early childhood professionals, as a group, moved in and out of their profession.

In summary, study of the current career patterns of women was limited. Several theorists proposed profiles or stages of career development. It was not demonstrated that these profiles or stages typically represented that of early childhood professionals.

Occupational Value and Social Status

According to Bernard (1981), the job a woman does was closely related to or associated with feelings of identity, worth, and self-esteem. Over a quarter of a century ago, White (1959, 1975)) suggested that all humans needed to interact competently and effectively with the environment. Huyck and Hoyer (1982) pointed out that work organized and gave direction to life by acting as an axis along which plans were made. Work fixed position in society and often times determined the pattern of social participation.

Long ago Parsons (1940, 1942) hypothesized that a woman's work involvement outside the home introduced marital stress. Historically, families attained status from functional ties to the occupational system. It was first believed that wives derived their social status solely from the occupations of their husbands (Hiller &

Philliber, 1976). The family was a unit which required that all members were evaluated equally. Husbands, as majority and continuous participants in the labor force, were the source of occupational status for all family members (Ritter & Hargens, 1975).

Other studies of more recent family work patterns have shown an independent effect of wife's own occupational achievement in determining perception of her social and occupational status (Hudis, 1976). Ritter and Hargens (1975) found that married women do not consistently evaluate their statuses by their spouses' occupations.

Parsons (1940) hypothesized that social status and occupational value were affected by similar factors. Since this landmark work, research demonstrated that female social status was affected by the prestige of an occupation, either in terms of personal perceptions (Philliber & Hiller, 1983) or the perceptions of significant others (Rossi et al., 1974). Spitze and Waite (1981) reported husband's attitudes toward employment significantly affected women's own attitudes toward their labor force participation. Huber and Spitze (1981) concurred that a positive attitude from husbands produced immediate and specific effects including increased positive perceptions of wives of their own occupational worth (Weil, 1961).

Hoffman and Nye (1974) suggested that work was

important within the family, but little was known about the psychological linkage between work and home. Information concerning differences between the perceptions others held about the value of early childhood occupations was not found within the literature. Yet, perceptions of familial attitudes of occupational worth would help define the work-home connection.

There were a few studies which indirectly examined occupational attitudes of female workers (Angrist & Almquist, 1975). Research was available on women in selected, primarily non-traditional occupations such as medicine (Cartwright, 1972; Walsh, 1977), engineering (Perrucci, 1970), and high level management (Hennig & Jardim, 1977) but these studies were not focused on perceptions of occupational worth. Lopata's (1971) study of housewives explored perceptions of women who care for children as mothers within the family and home. Variation in the way women approached the occupation of housewife and caregiver was apparent. Women listed many pleasures in their work. More educated and career-oriented housewives reported the need to justify to others and to themselves their work as mothers and housewives.

In summary, female workers outside the home were first viewed as oddities (Wertz, 1982). As their participation in the labor force increased, more information was sought by social scientists (Bernard, 1981). Female career

choices were still relatively restricted (Haug, 1973). Women clustered in low-paying, low-status, traditionally feminine occupations (Bloxall & Reagan, 1978; Selkow, 1984).

Overall, there was no literature directly pertaining to women's perception of occupational worth. The literature dealing with female employment was largely exploratory in nature and suggested that females were socialized very early in life to expect, and then to actually participate in, female occupations. Yet society's expectations about female participation in the labor force were found to be changing. The dual role of wife and mother was being expanded into the more complex multiple role of wife, mother and labor force participant. If this were not difficult enough, women discovered additionally that in some occupations their duties as labor force participants were not valued or recognized. Most early childhood occupations included the same types of duties earlier subsumed within the roles of wife and mother. These historically have not afforded monetary compensation. With unclear societal value and meager financial reward, early childhood professionals may themselves be biased about the worth of jobs within their own profession. The thrust of the present study is to describe early childhood professionals' perceptions of their occupational worth as measured by the Occupational Worth Inventory (OWI).

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

Review of the literature revealed lack of instruments to assess the perception of occupational worth of early childhood professionals. Sociological trends in this culture indicated that increasing numbers of children and families would be involved with early childhood professionals, members of a diverse and scarcely studied profession which is evolving and expanding. Little is known about the occupational worth perceived by those within the profession. Thus the major objective of the present study was to investigate early childhood professionals' perceptions of their own and their peers occupational worth. Career pattern profiles were examined descriptively. Perception of one's reference groups' values also were studied.

Subjects

Data were collected from 400 early childhood professionals who worked in licensed facilities and attended behavior management workshops across the state of Nebraska. Included in the sample were 104 family day care home providers, 26 group day care home providers, 101 day care center providers, 26 Head Start teachers, and 95 nursery school teachers. Data from the eight male early childhood professionals and 40 senior citizen foster

grandparents who responded were not included in the data analysis. The total number of subjects used in this study was 352.

The subjects came from widely diverse geographic locations ranging from the rural Nebraska Panhandle (40.6%) to the more heavily populated eastern border cities (59.4%). The ages for the entire sample ranged from 15 years to over 66 years of age. Slightly over four percent of the sample ranged from 15 to 20 years; 40.9% ranged from 21 to 30 years; 49.2% ranged from 31 to 50 years; and 5.4% ranged from 51 to 66 years or older.

Marital status was diverse. There were 47 (13.4%) single, 281 (80.1%) married, four (1.1%) widowed, five (1.4%) separated, and 14 (4%) divorced respondents. Marital status was not indicated for one subject. Sixty-eight percent of the subjects had children and the children ranged in age from one to 40 years. The income level of respondents ranged from lower class to upper middle class. Subjects reported yearly family incomes ranging from less than $4999.00 (4.0%) to over $60,000.00 (.3%). Nearly one-half of the workshop attendants reported yearly family incomes of less than $19,999.00. Income level by early childhood occupations did not differ significantly. All educational levels were represented within the sample ranging from of grade school experiences only (4.0%) to advanced graduate degrees (7.5%). High

school educated professionals constituted one-third of the respondents (34.5%). Another third (34.2%) reported vocational training, associate degrees, or Child Development Associate credentials.

Grant Development

In July, 1985, a Department of Social Services (DSS) training grant for $22,523.00 was awarded to the researcher. The overall purpose of the grant was to provide early childhood caregivers and teachers working in state licensed facilities with alternatives to physical discipline of the children and youth in their care. Target groups for this training included day care homes, group day care homes, day care centers, nursery schools, Head Start programs, and foster parents. Through monies provided to DSS via the federal Department of Health and Human Services, materials for 24 behavior management workshops were developed and compiled.

Instrument

Assessment of subjects' perceptions of occupational worth was made through administering to them the Occupational Worth Inventory (OWI) developed specifically for the present study. The OWI contained four sections: background information, job characteristics, education and training, and job values. The OWI is located in Appendix

A.

Background information included questions about age, sex, and marital status of the respondent. Number and ages of their children was requested, as was information about family income.

Job characteristics dealt with information about job roles, conditions and benefits. Information also was sought on how long the respondent had held a position in an early childhood occupation, how long she expected to hold a position in the field, and how long she had been in her present position.

Education and training, an extension of background information, asked for information about the respondent's formal education and her major field of study.

In the job values section early childhood professionals were asked to rank order early childhood occupations by deserved job pay, deserved job status, actual job value. Ratings were also obtained for selected male and female professions and early childhood and teacher occupations.

Procedure

An initial draft of the OWI was made based on information obtained by review of the literature. The present study was exploratory. While the question of relative occupational worth was of interest to those in

early childhood professions, the literature was not clear in giving direction for content of surveys such as the OWI. Therefore the author's experience together with a best judgment based on the literature reviewed form the framework for the items contained on the OWI. The OWI was reviewed by 24 senior level early childhood education student teachers studying at the Ruth Staples Child Development Laboratory at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Student teacher participation was voluntary. These students asked questions which clarified survey items and they provided an indication of the time needed for survey completion. The OWI was revised accordingly.

Pilot testing of the OWI involved 12 daycare providers and four nursery school teachers who offered suggestions for re-wording and item clarification on three items. It was determined that it would take approximately 20 minutes to complete the survey. Following minor editorial changes, the OWI was considered appropriate for use in the present study. Appendix A contains the OWI as it was used for this study.

Permission was obtained from DSS to use the OWI in the workshop. The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by

the potential benefits and expected value of knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures. Permission was obtained from the committee to allow survey completion by workshop attendants. Appendix B contains a copy of the Review Committee form. Letters explaining the project and delineating subjects' rights are in Appendix C.

Workshops were held in two time blocks. In the fall of 1985, twelve workshops were held in four western and west central Nebraska locations. In the spring of 1986, the final twelve workshops were held in the east central and eastern Nebraska sites. Flyers announcing the workshops were mailed three weeks in advance of each workshop to all licensed facilities in the state. Pre-registration was requested, but not required. At two of the 24 workshops, participants were turned away when enrollment reached 50 participants. All other workshops had enrollments between two and 50. Workshops were also attended by 40 senior citizen foster grandparents. Seven spouses not employed in an early childhood occupation and 10 workshop participants who identified themselves as non-professionals (cook, bus driver, boy friend, neighbor) did not complete the survey.

As a part of the grant, training was provided for the three facilitators and two graduate students who conducted the training and data collection. Human Subjects

guidelines were reviewed to ensure that the workshop presenters would adequately explain to workshop participants their rights. Participation and non-participation options were presented to all workshop attendants in oral and written form.

The OWI was administered at the end of the second hour of the three hours that constituted the workshops (7:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m.). In compliance with Human Subjects rules, participants were verbally advised that survey completion was both anonymous and optional. This information was also presented in written form on the cover letter found in Appendix C. All forms were returned to a box at the back of the room when each workshop was over. Subjects were advised to complete the surveys independently. Discussion of the survey "answers" was not entertained. Those interested in details were advised to contact the workshop project director at a telephone number or address provided in the workshop materials.

Of the 427 workshop participants, only 27 returned the surveys unanswered. Included in these 27 were the 10 non-professionals mentioned earlier. In all, 95.9% of those eligible completed the survey. After all workshops were completed, a coding booklet was compiled. This is located in Appendix D. Since all items were not completed by every respondent, unanswered items were coded as missing data and left blank.

Statistical Analysis

To determine overall whether rank ordering on job pay, job status, and job value was significantly related to group, Friedman's rank order analyses of variance using a randomized block design with repeated measures on dependent variables job pay, job status, and job value and independent variable group were used to reduce error variance and obtain a more powerful test (Kirk, 1982). To detect differences between early childhood groups in their ratings of the social status of male and female occupations (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979), four separate analyses of variance were performed on the dependent variables male occupations, female occupations, early childhood worker, and teacher and the independent variable group.

To investigate group differences between early childhood workers' perceptions of their job worth, the dependent variable score and independent variable group were also analyzed using an analyses of variance. Frequencies and means were calculated on OWI demographic and professional data, such as age, income, marital status, education and career pattern profile.

RESULTS

Major Findings

The purpose of the present study is to describe early childhood professionals' perceptions of their occupational worth as represented in their responses on the OWI. Differences in responses of day care home providers, group day care home providers, day care center teachers, Head Start, and nursery school teachers are presented in the first section for job variables representing group rankings for job pay, job status, and job value. The second section deals with analyses of group ratings for male, female, early childhood workers, and teacher occupations. Support variables including perceptions of family and client ratings, career pattern profiles, and indices of professionalism are found in the final section.

Job Variables

All subjects rank-order deserved job pay for the five early childhood occupations studied (day care home providers, group day care home providers, day care center teachers, Head Start teachers, nursery school teachers). Occupations are ranked on a five point scale of deserved lowest pay (1) to deserved highest pay (5). Rankings of job pay by group were subject to analysis of variance with Friedman technique which reveals a significant effect for group, $F(4,335)=2.41$, $p<.05$,

and subject, $F(4,335)=12.78$, $p<.001$. This indicates a high degree of variability between subjects and within occupational group on the ranking of jobs on the basis of deserved pay. Subjects did not agree on which job deserves the most pay.

The results of the Duncan Multiple Range Comparison post-hoc test (Strahan, 1986) indicate that day care home providers rank order ($M=3.13$) job pay differently than nursery school teachers ($M=3.20$), group day care providers ($M=3.19$), day care center teachers ($M=3.09$) and Head Start teachers ($M=3.08$). Nursery school teachers ($M=3.20$) and group day care home providers ($M=3.19$) rank order job pay for the five early childhood occupations in significantly different ways than day care center teachers ($M=3.09$) and Head Start teachers ($M=3.08$).

Significant Pearson Product Moment coefficients of correlations for job pay rankings of day care home providers and age $r=.14$, $p<.01$, and income, $r=.07$, $p<.01$, suggest that older married subjects with higher incomes report day care home providers should receive higher pay. Significant correlations between job pay rankings of Head Start teachers and income, $r=.14$, $p<.01$, and education, $r=-.13$, $p.<.05$, indicate that subjects with higher total family incomes give higher rankings on Head Start job pay, while subjects with more education give lower rankings on the same variable.

Rank order of job status by each of the five early childhood occupations studied is performed using a scale of

deserved lowest status (1) to deserved highest status (5). The results of the analysis of variance for job status by group reveal a significant effect for group, $F(4,339)=6.75$, $p<.0001$, and subject, $F(4,339)=3.50$, $p<001$. This indicates a high degree of variability between subjects and within occupational groups about which early childhood occupation commands the most job status. Results of the post hoc comparison test indicate that job status rank orderings of nursery school teachers ($M=3.43$) differ significantly from those of day care center teachers ($M=3.24$), Head Start teachers ($M=3.23$), group day care home providers ($M=3.23$), and day care home providers ($M=3.07$). Likewise, job status rank orderings of day care home providers ($M=3.07$) differ significantly from those of nursery school teachers ($M=3.43$), day care center teachers ($M=3.24$), Head Start teachers ($M=3.23$) and group day care home provides ($M=3.23$)

All subjects rank-ordered job value for all five early childhood occupations studied. Occupations were ranked on a five point scale of lowest job value (1) to highest job value (5). Analyses of variance for job value did not yield a significant effect for group or subject. Therefore, it may be of interest to examine the rankings of job value on the five groups studied. Rankings indicate that nursery school teaching ($M=3.08$), followed by day care home providing ($M=3.01$), group day care home providing ($M=3.00$), and Head Start teaching respectively are viewed as commanding the most

value by subjects. Statistically significant correlations between the job value ranking for day care home providers and income, r=.15, p<.05, indicate that as the total reported family income increases, so does the ranking on job value for day care home providers. A statistically significant negative correlation between Head Start job value rankings and education, r=-.20, p<.001, indicates that more educated subjects assigned lower job value to Head Start occupations than did less educated respondents.

Occupation Ratings

To facilitate data analysis, ratings of twelve occupations (secretary, child care worker, registered nurse, receptionist, preschool teacher, kindergarten teacher, telephone operator, bank teller, elementary school teacher, librarian, nursing aide, social and recreation worker) are combined to create the female occupations variable (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). The same procedure is used for the remaining twelve occupations (real estate agent, computer specialist, physician, farmer, engineer, lawyer, police officer, dentist, carpenter, truck driver, automobile mechanic, rancher) to create the male occupation variable (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). Ratings of three jobs within the female occupation list (child care worker, nursery school teacher, kindergarten teacher) are combined to create the early childhood occupation variable. Whitebook (1984)

suggests that these last three jobs listed are historically described as early childhood occupations. Teacher occupation is constructed from the combined ratings of nursery school teacher, kindergarten teacher, and elementary teacher. It is believed that the term teacher carries a different connotation than caregiver or provider. Therefore, these teacher occupations are grouped by this title.

The results of the analysis of variance for female occupations by group reveal a significant effect for group, $F(4,340)=2.90$, $p<.05$. Little agreement is found between the five groups studied on their ratings of jobs typically performed by women in this culture. The results of the post-hoc test reveal only one comparison. This comparison suggests that day care center teachers' ratings ($M=37.94$) of female jobs differ significantly from those of group day care home providers ($M=34.65$). Day care center teachers assign higher status to female occupations than do group day care home providers.

On male occupation ratings the results of the analysis of variance for male occupations by group indicate a significant effect for group, $F(4,340)=8.40$, $p<.0001$. This result is similar to that found for female occupations and suggests little agreement between early childhood groups on ratings of jobs men typically do in this society. The results of the post hoc test reveal that the highest ratings are those of day care home providers ($M=43.97$). These ratings differ

significantly from all other groups studied. Head Start teachers (M=39.00) and group day care home teacher ratings (M=38.85) differ significantly from those of day care home providers (M=43.97) and day care center teachers (M=41.89).

The results of the analysis of variance for early childhood worker by group reveal no significant group differences. This suggests that the five groups studied rate some early childhood occupations more highly than others. Inspection of the group means illustrates the order of these ratings. The ratings for the early childhood worker demonstrates that kindergarten teachers (M=3.74) are valued highest, nursery school teachers (M=3.21) are valued next highest, and child care workers (M=2.50) least. The ratings decline in proportion to the average age of child served across these three occupations. Those jobs which include work with the youngest children are rated lowest.

An analysis of variance for teacher occupation by group reveal a significant effect for group, $F(4,340)=3.63$, $p<.01$. The five early childhood occupational groups differ in statistically significant ways in their overall ratings of teacher occupations. The groups do not agree on which teaching occupation derives the most status from society. Inspection of the numerically close group means reveals that these occupation ratings increase with the age of child typically taught within an occupation. Elementary teachers

(M=3.89) receive the highest ratings, followed by kindergarten teachers (M=3.74) and nursery school teachers (M=3.21).

The variable entitled score is used as an overall indicator for early childhood professionals' perceived outside support for their respective jobs. Analysis of variance results of score by group reveal significant effect for group, $F(4,340)=5.60$, $p<.001$. Table 1 presents a summary of eight separate analyses of variance for each of the sources included in the score variable. Only the variable child client produces non-significant results. Perceptions of easily identifiable support from others are not apparent. Workers do not agree on the way significant others in their lives feel about the importance of caring for and teaching young children.

Table 1. Summary Analyses of Variance for Support Systems

Source	Summary Data by Support Categories		
	Mean Squares	df	F-Value
Self	2.51	4	12.24*
Spouse/Significant Other	24.29	4	14.31*
Child	8.71	4	3.74*
Mother	3.30	4	3.18*
Father	4.13	4	3.45*
Child Client	0.53	4	0.82 N.S.
Parent Client	8.22	4	12.88*
Society	10.14	4	6.12*

*$p<.001$.

Career Pattern Profiles

Subjects identify scenarios best describing their work experiences. Approximately one-half (46.8%) report careers which end in no current labor market status including: no work outside the home (4.4%), marriage (14.9%), or homemaking career (27.5%). This suggests that for some subjects, their present early childhood occupation is not being considered as true employment.

Subjects in this study were asked if they considered themselves to be professionals. Nearly three-fourths (74.9%) of the 351 who responded identify themselves as business people. Just over one-half of the respondents (51.2%) report belonging to no professional early childhood organization. Twenty-seven percent belong to one, 17.5% belong to two, and 4.3% belong to three or more organizations. One-third of the subjects report they are unlikely to pursue their careers again. Two-thirds suggest they are somewhat or very likely to train for their present jobs once more.

When asked about the longevity of time spent in their early childhood occupation, 48.0% of the early childhood professionals report working in the area for two years or less. Working four years or less is reported by 65.9% of the 352 respondents. And six years or less service is listed for 84.3% of the workshop attendants. Over half the subjects surveyed (53.8%) report they do not know how long they would

stay in the early childhood field. Nearly one-fourth (24.6%) believe they will remain one to five years. The remaining 21.6% estimate their professional longevity between six and 40 years.

In conclusion, the null hypothesis stating there are no significant group differences on job pay, job status and job value as measured by the OWI is rejected for job pay and job status and fails to be rejected for job value. The null hypothesis stating there are no significant group differences on occupational rankings as measured by the OWI is rejected.

DISCUSSION

The pattern of findings yields a complex but provocative picture of early childhood professionals' perceptions of their occupational worth. The results of the data analyses are supportive of four major conclusions. First, the five groups studied vary in their views about which occupation within the profession should command the most pay or derive the most status. Second, subjects differ in their ratings of occupations predominantly held by male workers, female workers, and teachers. Third, no single career pattern profile typifies professionals in this field. Fourth, absence of significant group differences in job value rankings and early childhood worker ratings suggests a positional trend wherein nursery school teaching is most and Head Start teaching is least valued.

Results reveal small mean differences in most analyses performed. It is possible that statistically significant results would not emerge in a smaller sample. Yet differences do occur in this study and represent actual differences in the way groups of early childhood workers rank and rate their own and other professions. It becomes important to question why such small differences between means emerge. The review of literature suggests that many jobs performed by early childhood are low status and low paying (Bernard, 1981; Eccles & Hoffman, 1984). Krause (1983) posits that changes in employment patterns promote conflicting beliefs about the

roles women should play at home and in the labor market. Evaluation of self and peers may be ego-threatening. Early childhood professionals may have difficulty assigning one segment of their profession more worth than another. One workshop participant clearly articulated these feelings when she commented: "How can you have us do this? The job is hard enough without pitting us against one another." Overall, no clear consensus about a professional hierarchy emerges. The group differences suggest that the profession is unclear in its view about which jobs are most valuable, but subtle biases appear as all results are considered.

Major Findings

Job Variables

Statistically significant effects for group and subject for job pay and job status suggest that subjects disagree among themselves and between their occupational groups on the occupation which should receive the most pay or status. There is, however, no statistically significant effect for job value. Job value is construed as the most personal of the three variables. It is less affected by outside influences. A worker may feel a job is inherently important, regardless of the pay or status it commands. Overall mean rankings for job value suggest that subjects rank nursery school teachers highest, Head Start teachers lowest, and day care workers in

between. Similar patterns appear in other analyses, even when there exists large group and subject variability.

Income emerges as a consistently significant correlate for day care home rankings on all job variables. Positive correlations with job pay and job value suggest that subjects who had access to higher total family income believe day care providers deserve higher pay and contribute more to society. Statistically significant correlations between income and job status reveal that subjects with higher total family income rate job status lower for all day care professionals and higher for Head Start and nursery school teachers. This reflects a negative attitude about the status of day care workers by more affluent early childhood professionals. Education influences subjects' rankings of job pay for Head Start teachers. More educated subjects indicate that Head Start teachers deserve lower pay than teachers in other occupations.

The second highest ranking of group day care home providers is not explained easily. Definition of occupations are deliberately not present on the OWI. Phillips and Whitebook (1986) note considerable confusion within the early childhood profession about accepted nomenclature for different occupations. To avoid this issue, definitions are omitted on the OWI. But group day care homes exist in Nebraska as separately licensed facilities. It is possible that subjects

are unclear about what group day care is and consequently assign higher rankings to it throughout the study.

Occupation Ratings

Occupation choice is influenced by a wide variety of variables (Featherman and Hauser, 1974). Early socialization (Block, 1983), career preference (Huyck and Hoyer, 1982), career expectation (Daymont and Andresani, 1984) and awareness of job values within a society influence perceptions of occupational worth for all jobs. Ratings of male and female occupations reveal a familiar pattern. There appears to be no group agreement about the worth of these jobs. Early childhood professionals vary significantly in these ratings. This lack of consensus documents significant differences within the profession.

Results of analyses on the occupation ratings of early childhood workers and teachers provide additional insight. Though the occupations within each of these variable categories co-occur, the ratings do differ. Significant group differences for teacher ratings suggest that no consensus about the value of the teaching profession is found. On ranking of jobs within their own profession, early childhood professionals do not agree on relative worth of each occupation. But on ratings of early childhood occupations identified within the census data, group differences disappear.

In both the teacher and early childhood worker data those occupations traditionally dealing with older children in longer established settings receive highest ratings. Those dealing with the youngest children in day care settings or Head Start receive the lowest ratings. Results from this study indicate that there is variability in the way jobs are valued. This variability is least pronounced when subjects are allowed to rate, rather than rank, occupations. Early childhood professionals place a higher value on occupations most closely tied to school institutions (i.e., teaching). They appear to value less the jobs which specifically serve the poorest and youngest members of society (i.e., caregiving and Head Start teaching).

In addition to messages from co-workers and co-professionals, workers also receive input about job value from a variety of outside resources. Analysis of the dependent variable score provide significant group differences. Early childhood professionals differ in their overall perception of the support they receive from those around them. Individual analyses indicate that for self, spouse, significant other, child, parents and clients there are significant group differences. Thus, no professional agreement about outside sources of support for feelings of job worth emerge in this sample. Only the analysis on the child client's perception of early childhood professionals job value is non-significant. These data illustrate that, as professionals, early childhood

workers do not agree on how their jobs are perceived by important people in their lives. A recognizable outside job support system is not apparent.

Career Pattern Profiles

Several studies indicate that work patterns of women differ from those of men (Super, 1957; Zaccaria, 1970). Jobs such as nursery school teaching and child caregiving are often not included in labor force statistics. When asked about their career pattern profile (or how they enter and leave the work force), subjects provide interesting information. Data collected for this study are obtained during workshops given specifically for professionals currently employed within licensed early childhood facilities. Yet nearly one half (46.8%) of all respondents list career pattern profiles that end in non-career jobs. Apparently, large numbers of subjects do not see themselves as employed. Therefore, it is not surprising that within the profession there is little agreement about ratings and ranking of different occupations.

To test this interpretation further, responses to the question "Are you a professional?" are considered. Nearly three-fourths (74.9%) of all subjects consider themselves professionals. This suggests an awareness that early childhood jobs are professional employment opportunities. The response to the career pattern profile item may indicate this sense of professionalism is not yet completely internalized.

Membership in professional organizations should also indicate attitudes about professionalism. Just over one-half (51.2%) of workshop attendants report no membership in professional organizations, while 27% belong to one, 17.5% to two, and 4.3% belong to three or more professional groups or organizations.

Career expectation is influenced by societal expectations. Females expect to choose careers in nursing, teaching, and other helping professions (Huston, 1983). Careers chosen as expectations are not always kept for a lifetime. As a group, respondents in this study spent very little time in the early childhood profession. Nearly one-half (48.0%) have been early childhood professionals for two years or less; nearly two-thirds (65.9%) have worked four years or less; and just over four-fifths (84.3%) worked six years or less. Subjects report not knowing how long they will remain in the early childhood profession 53.8% of the time. One-third believe they are unlikely to enter an early childhood career again. Perhaps early childhood professions are being used as a stopover or semi-permanent career by some subjects. In these cases, the need or desire to pursue early childhood occupations may actually change as workers proceed into the next phase of their life cycle.

Limitations of Study

Data for this study are collected from early childhood professionals working in licensed facilities. Given that

these people voluntarily took part in the inservices, they are not necessarily representative of all early childhood professionals in Nebraska. But because workshop attendants represent a sizable proportion of the early childhood professionals in the state, there is some value to the data they provide on the OWI.

Ratings and rankings produce different data. Subjects did not rate all five early childhood occupations studied. Yet, ratings such as these may provide additional information. On the occupation rating list, the first twelve are female and the second twelve are male occupations. By assigning these occupations random positions on the survey, a different outcome may occur. The uneven group sizes may contribute to some of the variability, but the overall large number is assumed to compensate for this imbalance. On occasions, participants indicate to workshop presenters that completion of the OWI is tedious. The OWI may have been long for some, but it was completed by the majority of subjects.

Implications for Future Research

The major finding of this study is that early childhood professionals vary in their perceptions of occupational worth as measured by responses to items on the OWI. This suggests that a wide variety of people, doing a wide variety of jobs, for a wide variety of reasons are not easily studied or guided under one professional umbrella. In proposing direction for

future research, three areas of consideration are offered. These include professionalism, teacher training, and social policy.

The professionalization of early childhood workers is an on-going concern. While theorists speculate on the characteristics of the early childhood profession (Radomski, 1986), a more basic issue remains unaddressed. Subjects report being professionals when directly asked. These same respondents report a no-job status on career pattern profiles, few professional affiliations, and unclear direction about anticipated length in the field. At the very least, this suggests an underlying or subconscious view by some early childhood workers that they are not professionally employed. Future studies might investigate this phenomenon.

Professionalism is manifested in the form of active participation in organizations and activities or in quiet and isolated settings searching for better ways to meet the needs of children and families. There is a need for well-designed cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of workers at every level and within each occupation. The lack of comprehensive, reliable data impedes the early childhood community's efforts to dismiss destructive stereotypes and promote itself as a viable and valuable profession (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986). Until it is understood how the neighborhood "babysitter" becomes an early childhood professional, the profession remains unable to tap the occupation that is involved with the

largest number of young children. Until it becomes known how subtle biases about occupations affect workers in this field, it will be difficult to draw the profession together.

Early childhood employment patterns over the life cycle are not currently available. Using data collected from the CWI, institutions responsible for teacher training may identify patterns upon which programs can be developed. Over two-thirds of the population studied report being in the profession for six years or less. For some occupations within this field, membership appears to be goal and time specific. Some subjects estimate short participation, others anticipate a lifelong commitment. Future research might investigate how different types of institutions are responding to these professionally diverse needs. When training services are offered, it is not known what are the significant differential that exists among those receiving and not receiving training or information of any kind.

Using Karp and Yoel's (1985) occupational stages, the data from this study suggest many workers never get beyond the preparation and exploration stage of career development. Therefore, training opportunities are best designed to meet the needs of the least professional, as well as the most professional members in the field. The worker who has clearly decided to care for children only while her own children are young, the worker who uses nursery school teaching as first employment or day care providing merely as a financial

necessity may have similar short-term, but very different long-term needs than the twenty year early childhood veteran.

Responses on the occupation ratings and rankings within this study suggest significant differences in how jobs are perceived. Subtle biases also emerge. Nursery school teaching appears to command the most respect, day care and Head Start teaching the least. Future research might investigate the effect of informing members about the variety of occupations within the profession and encouraging frank dialogue about differences and biases between occupational groups. This effort would contribute to the development of a national data base. An occupational worth inventory would offer pertinent information to those who train professionals, provide inservice opportunities, regulate licensure, and create social policy.

There is a growing interest in how changing work patterns are influencing the socialization of future generations (Bernard, 1981; Bloxall & Reagan, 1978). The most apparent consequence of increasing numbers of working parents is that others are needed to fill child care and informal teaching responsibilities as parents enter the work force. For parents work supplies, among other things, monetary compensation. It also supplies opportunity for their children to spend large blocks of time with another worker - the early childhood professional. It appears important to this writer that early childhood professionals feel a high degree of positive

occupational value. Without this sense of professional worth, children may see mother go to work in a three-piece business suit, only to be left in the care of a woman who is unclear about the value of her job. How far does this, in fact, advance children's thinking about the role and value of women in society? The answer may not be known until the next generation reaches adulthood.

The overwhelming lack of consensus on important issues such as job worth and professional support systems presents a message and mission to those interested in solidifying the early childhood education profession. Perhaps early childhood professionals are their own worst enemies - fragmented and multi-focused. The results of this study speak loudly to the need to empirically investigate, organize, encourage professionalism and enhance public awareness and support of the early childhood profession. To create a more powerful constituency to speak to the needs of those who work with young children, development of a national data base seems warranted. Advocacy begins with accurate and timely information disseminated not only to the public, but to the workers themselves. These workers with long hours, low pay, low status, require support and encouragement, which can only be effective if an accurate understanding of worker perception of job value is available. This study represents a first step in that direction.

REFERENCES

Ames, A. (1874). Sex in industry. Boston: Boston Press.

Aneshensel, C.S., & Rosen, B.C. (1980). Domestic roles and sex differences in occupational expectations. Journal of Marriage and Family, 2, 121-131.

Angrist, S.S., & Almquist, E.M. (1975). Careers and contingencies. New York: Dunellin.

Baker, E.F. (1964). Technology and women's work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Barnett, R. (1975). Sex differences and age trends in occupational preference and occupational prestige. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 35-38.

Barry, H.H., III, Bacon, M.K., & Child, I.L. (1957). A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55, 327-332.

Bernard, J. (1981). The female world. New York: The Free Press.

Blakemore, J.E.O., La Rue, A.A., & Olejnik, A.B. (1979). Sex-appropriate toy preference and the ability to conceptualize toys as sex-related. Developmental Psychology, 15, 339-340.

Block, J.H. (1973). Conceptions of sex roles: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 28, 521-526.

Block, J.H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of sexes: Some conjectures. DC, 54, 1335-1354.

Bloxall, M., & Reagan, B. (Eds.) (1978). Women and the workplace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bogie, D. (1976). Occupational aspiration-expectation discrepancies among high school seniors. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 24, 250-255.

Branders, L.D., & Goldmark, J. (1918). The case against nightwork for women. New York: National Consumers League, 224-275.

Bryson, J.B., & Bryson, R. (1978). Preface to the special edition on dual-career couples. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3.

Carter, D.B., & Patterson, C.J. (1979). Sex roles as social conventions: The development of children's conceptions of sex-role stereotypes. Developmental Psychology, 15, 333-338.

Cartwright, L.K. (1972). Conscious factors entering into decisions of women to study medicine. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 201-216.

Clarke, E.H. (1873). Sex in education: A fair chance for girls. Boston: Boston Press.

Clarke-Stewart, K.A., & Fein, G.G. (1983). Early childhood programs. In Paul H. Mussen (Ed.) Handbook of child psychology. New York: John Wiley.

Danzier, N. (1983). Sex-related differences in the aspirations of high school students. Sex Roles, 9, 683-695.

Daymont, T.N., & Andresani, P.J. (1984). Job preferences, college major, and the gender gap in earnings. Journal of Human Resources, 19, 408-428.

DeVries, R. (1969). Constancy of generic identity in the years three to six. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 36 (Serial No 127).

Eccles, J.S., & Hoffman, L.W. (1984). Sex roles, socialization, and occupational behavior. In H.W. Stevenson and A.E. Siegel (Eds.). Child development research and social policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edelbrock, C., & Sugawara, A.I. (1978). Acquisition of sex-typed preferences in preschool-aged children. Developmental Psychology, 66, 811-816.

Epstein, G.F., & Broncraft, A.L. (1978). Females' modesty and aspiration levels. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 66-70.

Featherman, D.L., & Hauser, R.M. (1974). Sexual inequalities and socioeconomic achievement in the U.S., 1962-1973. American Sociological Review, 41, 462-483.

Garfinkle, D. (1969). Work in the lives of women. Proceedings of the International Population Conference, London, Vol. III, 1601-1613.

Getty, L.D., & Cahn, A. (1981). Children's perceptions of occupational sex stereotypes. Sex Roles, 7, 301-308.

Gove, W. (1972). The relationship between sex roles, marital status, and mental illness. Social Forces 51, 34-44.

Gove, W., & Tudor, J. (1973). Adult sex roles and mental illness. American Journal of Sociology 78, 812-835.

Hamilton, A. (1929). Industrial poisons in the United States. New York: National Consumers' League.

Haug, M. (1973). Social class measures and women's occupational roles. Social Forces, 52, 86-98.

Hawkes, T. (1973). Ideals of upper elementary school children. Psychology in the Schools, 10, 447-457.

Hayghe, H. (1976). Families and the rise of working wives: An overview. Monthly Labor Review, 11, 12-19.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hiller, D.V., & Philliber, W.W. (1976). The derivation of status benefits from occupational attainment of working wives. Journal of Marriage and Family, 40, 63-65.

Hoffman, L.W. (1972). Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 129-155.

Hoffman, L.W. (1977). Changes in family roles, socialization, and sex differences. American Psychologist, 32, 644-657.

Hoffman, L.W. (1984). Work, family, and the socialization of the child. In Ross D. Parke (Ed.) Review of child development research. Vol. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hoffman, L.W., & Nye, F.I. (1974). Working mothers. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Huber, J., & Spitze, G.A. (1981) Wives' employment, household behaviors, and sex-role attitudes. Social Forces, 60, 150-169.

Hudis, P.M. (1976). Commitment to work and family: Marital-status differences in women's earnings. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 267-287.

Huston, C. (1983). Sex-typing. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.) Handbook of child psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Huston-Stein, A., & Higgins-Trenk, A. (1978). Development of females from childhood through adulthood: Career and feminine role orientations. In P.B. Baltes (Ed.), Life-span development and behavior. New York: Academic Press, (258-296).

Huyck, M.H., & Hoyer W.J. (1982). Adult development and aging. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Jennings, S.A. (1975). Effects of sex typing in children's stories on preference and recall. Child Development, 46, 220-223.

Karp, D.A., & Yoels, W.C. (1985). Work, Careers, and again. In B.B. Hess and E.W. Markson (Eds.) Growing old in America. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, Inc.

Kirk, R.E. (1982). Experimental design. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Kohlberg, L.A. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E.E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Krause, N. (1983). Conflicting sex-role expectations, housework dissastisfaction, and depressive symptoms among full-time housewives. Sex Roles 9, 1115-1125.

Kuhn, D., Nash, S.C., & Brucken, L. (1978). Sex role concepts of two- and three-year-olds. Child Development, 49, 445-451.

Lehrer, E. (1983). Determinants of child care mode choice: An economic perspective. Social Science Research, 12, 69-80.

Looft, W.R. (1971a). Sex differences in the expression of vocational aspirations by elementary school children. Developmental Psychology, 5, 336-371.

Looft, W.R. (1971b). Vocational aspirations of second-grade girls. Psychological Reports, 28, 241-242.

Lopata, H.Z. (1971). Occupation: Housewife. Oxford, London: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Maccoby, E.E. & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Marcus, E.E., & Overton, W.F. (1978). The development of cognitive gender constancy and sex role preferences. Child Development, 49, 434-444.

Marini, M.M. (1978). Sex differences in the determination of adolescent asperations: A review of research. Sex Roles, 4, 723-753.

McClendon, M.Y. (1976). The occupational status attainment process of males and females. American Sociological Review, 41, 52-64.

McConaghy, M.J. (1979). Gender permanence and the genital basis of gender: Stages in the development of constancy of gender identity. Child Development, 50, 1223-1226.

Money, J., & Ehrhardt, A.A. (1972). Man and women, boy and girl: The differentiation and dimorphism of gender identity from conception to maturity. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Oliver, T. (1916). Diseases of occupation. New York: National Consumers League.

Osborn, D.K. (1975). Early childhood education in historical perspectives. Athens, GA: Education Associates/University of Georgia.

Papalia, D., & Tennent, S. (1975). Vocational aspirations in preschoolers: A manifestation of early sex role stereotyping. Sex Roles, 1, 197-198.

Parsons, T. (1940). An analytical approach to the theory of social stratification. American Journal of Sociology, 45, 841-842.

Parsons, T. (1942). Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. American Sociological Review, 7, 604-616.

Perrucci, C.C. (1970). Minority status and the pursuit of prefessional careers: Women in sciences and engineering. Social Forces, 49, 245-258.

Philliber, W.W., & Hiller, D.V. (1983). A research note: Occupational attainments and perceptions of status among working wives. Journal of Marriage and Family, 43, 161-170.

Phillips, D., & Whitebook, M. (1986). Who are child care workers? Young Children, 41(4), 14-20.

Piotrkowski, C.S., & Crits-Christoph, P. (1981). Occupational life and women's family adjustment. Journal of Family Issues, 2, 126-147.

Pivar, D.J. (1973). Purity crusade: Sexual morality and social control, 1868-1900. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Radomski, M.A. (1986). Professionalism of early childhood educators: How far have we progressed? Young Children, 41(5), 20-23.

Rexroat, C. (1985). Women's work expectations and labor-market experience in early and middle life-cycle stages. Journal of Marriage and Family, 44, 135-142.

Ritter, K.V., & Hargens, L.L. (1975). Occupational positions and class identification of married working women: A test of the asymmetry hypothesis. American Journal of Sociology, 80, 934-948.

Rossi, P., Sampson, W., Bose, C., Guillermina, J. & Passel, J. (1974). Measuring household social standing. Social Science Research, 3, 169-190.

Ruble, D.N., & Ruble, T.L. (1980). Sex stereotypes. In A.G. Miller (Ed.) In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rudd, N.M., & McKenry, R.C. (1980). Working women: Issues and implications. Journal of Home Economics (Winter) 26-29.

Russo, N.F. (1976). The motherhood mandate. Journal of Social Issues 32, 145-154.

Scarr, S., Weinberg, R.A., & Levine, A. 1986. Understanding development. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Selkow, P. (1984). Effects of maternal employment on kindergarten and first-grade children's vocational aspirations. Sex Roles. 11, 677-691.

Siegel, D. (1973). Sex differences in the occupational choices of second graders. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 3, 15-19.

Slaby, R.G., & Frey, K.S. (1975). Development of gender constancy and selective attention to same-sex models. Child Development, 46, 849-856.

Smith, R.E. (1979). The subtle revolution. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Spitze, G.D., & Waite, L.J. (1981). Wives' employment: The role of husbands' perceived attitudes. Journal of Marriage and Family, 43, 117-124.

Stein, A.H. (1971). The effects of sex-role standards for achievement and sex-role preference on three determinants of achievement motivation. Developmental Psychology, 1, 111-114.

Strahan, R.F. (1986). Scope of correlational analysis. Unpublished manuscript. Iowa State University.

Super, D.E. (1957). The psychology of careers. New York: Harper & Row.

Tangri, S.S. (1972). Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 177-199.

Thompson, S.K. (1975). Gender labels and early sex role development. Child Development, 46, 339-347.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1980), Handbook of labor statistics - 1980, Bulletin No. 2070, U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1979). Statistical abstracts of the United States: 1979 (100th edition). Washington, DC, 416-418.

Walsh, M.R. (1977). Doctors wanted: No women need apply. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Weil, M.W. (1961). An analysis of the factors influencing married women's actual or planned work participation. American Sociological Review, 26, 91-96.

Wertz, D.C. (1982). Social science attitudes toward women workers, 1870-1970. International Journal of Women's Studies, 5, 161-171.

White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297-333.

White, R.W. (1975). Lives in progress. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Whitebook, M. (1984). Caring for children as work. In J.T. Greenman and R.W. Fuqua (Eds.) Making day care better. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zaccaria, J. (1970). Theories of occupational choice and vocational development. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to thank. Yet it is impossible to recognize all those who have guided and assisted me over the years.

To the members of my committee, Dr. Samuel Clark, Dr. Robert Fuqua, Dr. Robert Strahan, Dr. Joan Herwig and Dr. Elmer Schwieder, I am grateful for their guidance and expertise in this process.

And in my new home across the border, I am grateful to Gina Dunning, Director of the Department of Social Services and Deb Dawson, Licensing Consultant, for their grant support of my workshops, as well as their on-going advocacy for early childhood professionals of Nebraska.

To all the faculty and staff at the Child Development Laboratory at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, I am grateful for their assistance, concern, and humor as they watched me manage the logistics of this process.

To my husband, Michael, and our children, Michael, Eric and Megan, I am grateful for their understanding. They enabled me to finish this project with a modicum of guilt and an immense pride in us as a family.

And finally to all early childhood professionals, who labor daily to make the lives of children and families more secure and meaningful, I am grateful. We all in society should be grateful. Some of us just have not realized this yet.

APPENDIX A: OCCUPATIONAL WORTH INVENTORY (OWI).

OCCUPATIONAL WORTH INVENTORY

Directions

Please fill out the following questionnaire as completely as you can. It should take about 20 minutes to complete. Some sections have guides explaining the procedure for completion; read them carefully. Please complete EVERY item with the response you consider best. Thank you for your cooperation.

Backround Information

Please tell us a little about yourself.

1. Age:
   _____15-20
   _____21-25
   _____26-30
   _____31-35
   _____36-40
   _____41-45
   _____46-50
   _____51-55
   _____56-60
   _____61-65
   _____66+

2. Sex:
   _____male
   _____female

3. Marital Status:
   _____single, never married
   _____married
   _____widowed
   _____separated
   _____divorced

4. If married, what is your spouses's occupation?
   _____

5. What is/was your mother's occupation?
   _____

6. What is/was your father's occupation?
   _____

7a. Do you have any children?
   _____yes
   _____no

7b. If yes, circle the number which applies.
1 2 3 4 5 6 more than 6

8a. If yes, what is the age of the oldest?

_____

8b. If yes, what is the age of the youngest?

_____

9. In your present job do you care for your own children?
_____yes
_____no

10. In your present job do you care for children that are related to you?
_____yes
_____no

11. What is your total family yearly income?
_____less than $4,999
_____$5,000-$9,999
_____$10,000-$14,999
_____$15,000-$19,999
_____$20,000-$24,999
_____$25,000-$29,999
_____$30,000-$39,999
_____$40,000-$49,999
_____$50,000-$59,999
_____$60,000+

Education and Training

1. Formal education (check highest level completed):
_____less than high school
_____high school
_____post secondary, vocational school
_____CDA
_____associate degree (2 years)
_____bachelor degree
_____graduate work; not graduated
_____master degree
_____Ph.D., Ed.D.

2. If you attended college, what was your major field of study?
_____child development
_____human development
_____early childhood education
_____elementary education
_____psychology
_____social work
_____other, please list_____

Job Characteristics

1. What work do you do now?
_____day care home provider
_____group day care home provider
_____day care center teacher
_____nursery school teacher
_____Head Start teacher

2. How long in years have you been in your present job?
_____

3a. How long in years do you expect to remain in your present job?
_____

3b. How long in years do you expect to remain in an early childhood job?
_____

4a. Which of these tasks do you do on a regular basis in your job?
_____director/administrator
_____director/teacher
_____teacher
_____social worker
_____caregiver
_____therapist
_____nutritionist
_____nurse
_____aide or teaching assistant
_____custodian
_____bus driver
_____other, please list_____

4b. Which of these tasks is you MAJOR job?
Check only one:
_____director/administrator
_____director/teacher
_____teacher
_____social worker
_____caregiver
_____therapist
_____nutritionist
_____nurse
_____aide or teaching assistant
_____custodian
_____bus driver
_____other, please list_____

4c. Of the jobs you perform listed below, which would you consider secondary?
_____director/administrator
_____director/teacher
_____teacher
_____social worker
_____caregiver
_____therapist
_____nutritionist
_____nurse
_____aide or teaching assistant
_____custodian
_____bus driver
_____other, please list_____

5a. Have you ever taught in public or private school?
_____yes
_____no

5b. If yes, check grade taught:
_____kindergarten
_____elementary (1-6)
_____junior high (7-9)
_____high school (10-12)

6. What is the age of the youngest child with whom you work?
_____

7. What is the age of the oldest child with whom you work?
_____

8. What is the total number of children you care for or teach daily?
_____

9. Circle the days you work in an average week.
Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday

10. Check the time of day you work in an average week.
_____mornings only
_____afternoons only
_____evenings only
_____mornings and afternoons only
_____afternoons and evenings only
_____other, please list_____

11. How many of these hours are spent working directly with children?
_____

12. How many months a year do you work?

_____

13. During a typical working day, what is the adult/child ratio in your home, classroom, or center?

_____one adult for every two children
_____one adult for every three children
_____one adult for every four children
_____one adult for every five children
_____one adult for every six children
_____one adult for every seven children
_____one adult for every eight children
_____other, please list_____

14. What is your hourly salary?

_____$3.35 or less
_____$3.36 to $4.50
_____$4.51 to $6.00
_____$6.01 to $7.50
_____$7.51 or more
_____other, please list_____

15. Check any of the following benefits available to you through your present early childhood occupation. How many are:

AVAILABLE	USED
_____paid vacation	_____paid vacation
_____sick leave	_____sick leave
_____yearly bonus	_____yearly bonus
_____reduced or free child care	_____reduced or free child care
_____health insurance	_____health insurance
_____comprehensive insurance	_____comprehensive insurance
_____life insurance	_____life insurance
_____continuing education	_____continuing education
_____professional membership or attendance at conferences, workshops, seminars	_____professional membership or attendance at conferences, workshops, seminars
_____other, please list _____	_____other, please list _____

16. Was attending this workshop a requirement of your employment?

_____yes
_____no

17. Did you receive any financial support for attending this workshop?

_____yes
_____no

18. If yes, what support did you receive?
_____money
_____transportation
_____credit on hours workded
_____other, please list_____

Job Values

Circle the number that best applies to the following questions:

unimportant	slightly important	undecided	somewhat important	very important
1	2	3	4	5

		Circle the best response for each				
1.	How important do you feel your job is?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	How important does your spouse or significant other feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	How important does your child or children feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	How important does your mother feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	How important does your father feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	How do the children for whom you care feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	How important do the parents whose children you care for feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	How important does society generally feel YOUR job is?	1	2	3	4	5

9. If you were to train/pursue your career again, how likely would you be to choose your present job?
_____unlikely
_____not very likely
_____undecided
_____somewhat likely
_____very likely

10a. If all options were available to you and pay was equal, to what extent would you consider working in another early childhood job?
_____unlikely
_____not very likely
_____undecided
_____somewhat likely
_____very likely

10b. If your response to the above question was "somewhat likely" or "very likely", which would you prefer most?
_____day care home provider
_____group day care home provider
_____day care center teacher
_____Head Start teacher
_____nursery school teacher

11. To what extent do you think you are fairly paid for the job you do?
_____not at all fairly paid
_____somewhat fairly paid
_____undecided
_____fairly paid
_____very fairly paid

12. Assuming that pay reflects the value of the job, which of the following early childhood professionals SHOULD be paid the most? Use a scale from 1 to 5 (1=lowest and 5=highest)
_____day care home providers
_____group day care home providers
_____day care center teachers
_____Head Start teachers
_____nursery school teachers

13. Which of the following best describes your work experiences? Choose one.
_____school to marriage to no work outside the home
_____school to brief work experience to marriage
_____school to stable job for the remainder of work life
_____school to work to marriage to homemaking career
_____school to work to child rearing to return to work
_____school followed by unpredictable sequence of work, marriage
_____other, please list_____

_____

14. In any sociey, some jobs are prized more highly than others. Use a scale from 1 to 5 (1=lowest and 5=highest) to rate how you view the social status (amount of prestige) of each of the following jobs.
_____day care home provider
_____group day care home provider
_____day care center teacher
_____Head Start teacher
_____nursery school teacher

15. Rate on a five point scale (1=lowest and 5=highest) the social status or prestige of each of the following occupations or professions. Use the scale from 1 to 5 for <u>each</u> occuaption.

_____secretary
_____child care worker
_____registered nurse
_____receptionist
_____preschool
_____kindergarten teacher
_____telephone operator
_____bank teller
_____elementary school teacher
_____librarian
_____nursing aide
_____social and recreation worker
_____real estate agent
_____computer specialist
_____physician
_____farmer
_____engineer
_____lawyer
_____police officer
_____dentist
_____carpenter
_____truck driver
_____automobile mechanic
_____rancher

16. Jobs also vary in the importance of their actual contributions to society. Use a scale from 1 to 5 (1=lowest and 5=highest) to rate how you view the social value of each of the following jobs.

_____day care home provider
_____group day care home provider
_____day care center teacher
_____Head Start teacher
_____nursery school teacher

17. How successful do you think you are in your present job?

_____not at all successful
_____somewhat successful
_____undecided
_____successful
_____very successful

18. Do you consider yourself a business person?

_____yes
_____no

19. Do you consider yourself professionally employed?

_____yes
_____no

APPENDIX B: APPLICATION TO HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE

INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Early Childhood Professionals' Perception of Occupational Worth

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Typed Named of Principal Investigator	Date	Signature of Principal Investigator
Pauline Davey Zeece	10/18/85	Pauline Davey Zeece

Campus Address	Campus Telephone
215 Andrews	294-3040

RECEIVED OCT 21 '85 GRADUATE COLLEGE

3. Signatures of others (If any)

Signatures of others (If any)	Date	Relationship to Principal Investigator
Joan Clark	10/18/85	Major Professor

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

- ☐ Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
- ☐ Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
- ☐ Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
- ☐ Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
- ☐ Deception of subjects
- ☐ Subjects under 14 years of age and(or) ☐ Subjects 14-17 years of age
- ☐ Subjects in institutions
- ☐ Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

- ☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained.
- ☒ Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: Month 11 Day 4 Year 85

Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: Month 4 Day 30 Year 86

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and(or) identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments: Month ___ Day ___ Year ___

Signature of Head or Chairperson	Date	Department or Administrative Unit
Joan E. Newing	10/18/85	Child Development

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

☒ Project Approved ☐ Project not approved ☐ No action required

Name of Committee Chairperson	Date	Signature of Committee Chairperson
George G. Karas	11/25/85	GGKaras

Revised 6/78

Dear Workshop Participant:

As a Ph.D. candidate in child development at Iowa State University, I am interested in what early childhood professionals think about their jobs. For my dissertation research, I have designed the following survey to learn more about this.

You are being asked to fill out the attached questionnaire during the break at this workshop. You are not obligated in any way to do this and will receive full in-service credit regardless of your decision to answer or not answer this survey.

You may stop at any point and all answers will remain completely confidential. You will not be asked to sign your name so information about individual responses will not be available. A summary of all the responses gathered will be available from me at the end of summer upon request.

Surveys will be handed out to all workshop participants. If you choose not to participate simply return your survey unanswered at the end of the session.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this workshop and for considering participation in this survey.

All questions may be directed to me in writing or by phone at the following address: 110 Ruth Staples CDL
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0830

Sincerely,

Pauline Davey Zeece

Pauline Davey Zeece

Approved for the Committee

1/21/86

APPENDIX C: WORKSHOP LETTER OF EXPLANATION

University of Nebraska Lincoln

College of Home Economics
Department of Human
Development and the Family
Lincoln, NE 68583-0830

Dear Workshop Participants:

As a Ph.D. candidate in child development at Iowa State University, I am interested in what early childhood professionals think about their jobs. For my dissertation research, I have designed the attached survey to learn more about this.

You are being asked to fill out the attached questionnaire during the break at this workshop. You are not obligated in any way to do this and will receive full inservice credit regardless of your decision to answer or not answer this survey.

You may stop at any point and all answers will remain completely confidential. You will not be asked to sign your name so information about individual responses will not be available. A summary of all the responses will be available from me at the end of this project.

Surveys will be handed out to all participants. If you choose not to participate simply return your survey unanswered at the end of the session.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this workshop and for considering participation in this project.

All questions may be directed to me in writing or by phone at the following address: 110 Ruth Staples CDL
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68583-0830
402-472-1666

Sincerely,

Pauline Davey Zeece

Pauline Davey Zeece

APPENDIX D: CODING BOOKLET FOR THE OWI

OCCUPATIONAL WORTH INVENTORY CODING BOOKLET

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
CARD #1			
1-3	Subject number	001-999	
4	Line number	1	
5-6	Workshop number	01-24	
7	Workshop location		
	Scottsbluff	1	
	North Platte	2	
	Broken Bow	3	
	Grand Island	4	
	Auburn	5	
	Norfolk	6	
	Omaha	7	
	Lincoln	8	
8	Workshop level		
	Adolescent	1	
	Schoolage	2	
	Preschool	3	
9	Workshop presenter		
	Donlan	1	
	Corr	2	
	Zeece	3	
	Wysong	4	
10	Workshop time		
	Fall 1985	1	
	Spring 1986	2	
11-12	Age		
	15-20	01	
	21-25	02	
	26-30	03	
	31-35	04	
	36-40	05	
	41-45	06	
	46-50	07	
	51-55	08	
	56-60	09	
	61-65	10	
	66+	11	
13	Sex		
	Male	1	
	Female	2	
14	Marital Status		
	Single	1	
	Married	2	
	Widowed	3	
	Separated	4	
	Divorced	5	
	Other	7	

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
CARD #1			
15-16	Spouse's occupation		
	Farmer, rancher	01	
	Engineer	02	
	Teacher	03	
	Mgr. office	04	
	Factory worker	05	
	Welder	06	
	Secretary	07	
	Builder	08	
	Banker	09	
	Custodian	10	
	Social worker	11	
	Mechanic	12	
	Railroad worker	13	
	Trucker	14	
	Construction	15	
	Cook	16	
	Retail sales	17	
	Carpenter	18	
	Landscaper	19	
	Housewife/husband	20	
	Military	21	
	Civil service	22	
	Physical therapist	23	
	Visual arts	24	
	Butcher	25	
	Beautician	26	
	Pharmacist	27	
	Phone company	28	
	M.D.	29	
	Maid	30	
	Nurse	31	
	Librarian	32	
	Firefighter	33	
	Computer prog.	34	
	Dietician	35	
	Pilot	36	
	Student	37	
	Unemployed	38	
	Retired	39	
	Deceased	40	
17-18	Maternal occupation	01-40	USE ITEMS FROM 15-16
19-20	Paternal occupation	01-40	USE ITEMS FROM 15-16

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
CARD #1			
21	Number of children	Raw score	
22-23	Age/oldest child	Raw score	
24-25	Age/youngest child	Raw score	
26	Care for own child		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
27	Care for related child		
	Yes	1	
	No	2	
28-29	Yearly Income		
	Less than $4999	01	
	$5000-$9999	02	
	$10000-$14999	03	
	$15000-$19999	04	
	$20000-$24999	05	
	$25000-$29999	06	
	$30000-$39999	07	
	$40000-$49999	08	
	$50000-$59999	09	
	$60000+	10	
30	Formal education		
	Less than h.s.	1	
	High school	2	
	Post secondary	3	
	CDA	4	
	Associate degree	5	
	B.S.	6	
	Graduate wk, no degree	7	
	Ph.D., Ed.D.	8	
31-32	Major field		
	CD	01	
	Human development	02	
	Early childhood ed.	03	
	El. education	04	
	Psychology	05	
	Social work	06	
	Home economics	07	
	Human services	08	
	Business	09	
	Music	10	
	Interior design	11	
	Ag., Vocational tech.	12	
	Nursing	13	
	Christian education	14	
	Secretary	15	
	Liberal arts	16	

Column #	Item Description		Code	Comments
CARD #1				
	Beautician		17	
	English		18	
	History/philosophy		19	
	Other		20	
33	Work doing now			
	Day care home		1	
	Group day care home		2	
	Day care center		3	
	Head Start		4	
	Nursery school		5	
	Foster parents		6	
	Foster grandparents		7	
	Day care/nursery		8	
	Other		9	
34-35	Years in present job		Raw score	
36-37	Years expected in job		Raw score	
38-39	Years in ECE		Raw score	
	Applicable roles			
40	Director/admin.	yes	1	
		no	2	
41	Director/teach.	yes	1	
		no	2	
42	Teacher	yes	1	
		no	2	
43	Social wkr.	yes	1	
		no	2	
44	Caregiver	yes	1	
		no	2	
45	Therapist	yes	1	
		no	2	
46	Nutritionist	yes	1	
		no	2	
47	Nurse	yes	1	
		no	2	
48	Aide	yes	1	
		no	2	
49	Custodian	yes	1	
		no	2	
50	Bus driver	yes	1	
		no	2	
51	Other		Raw score	
52-53	Total (40-51)		Raw score	

Column #	Item Description		Code	Comments
CARD #1				
	Major role			
54	Director/admin.	yes	1	
		no	2	
55	Director/teach.	yes	1	
		no	2	
56	Teacher	yes	1	
		no	2	
57	Social wkr.	yes	1	
		no	2	
58	Caregiver	yes	1	
		no	2	
	Major roles			
59	Therapist	yes	1	
		no	2	
60	Nutritionist	yes	1	
		no	2	
61	Nurse	yes	1	
		no	2	
62	Aide	yes	1	
		no	2	
63	Custodian	yes	1	
		no	2	
64	Bus driver	yes	1	
		no	2	
65	Other		Raw score	
	Secondary role			
66	Director/ admin.	yes	1	
		no	2	
67	Director/teach.	yes	1	
		no	2	
68	Teacher	yes	1	
		no	2	
69	Social wkr.	yes	1	
		no	2	
70	Caregiver	yes	1	
		no	2	
71	Therapist	yes	1	
		no	2	
72	Nutritionist	yes	1	
		no	2	
73	Nurse	yes	1	
		no	2	
74	Aide	yes	1	
		no	2	
75	Custodian	yes	1	
		no	2	
76	Bus driver	yes	1	
		no	2	
77	Other		Raw score	
78	Public school	yes	1	
		no	2	

Column # / CARD # 1	Item Description	Code	Comments
79	Grades taught		
	None	0	
	Kindergarten	1	
	1-6	2	
	7-9	3	
	10-12	4	
80	BLANK		
CARD #2			
1-3	Subject number	001-999	
4	Line number	2	
5-6	Age youngest student	Raw score	
7-8	Age oldest student	Raw score	
9-10	Total children daily	Raw score	
11	Total days wkd weekly	Raw score	
12	Time of day worked		
	Mornings	1	
	Afternoons	2	
	Evenings	3	
	Mornings/afternoons	4	
	Afternoons/evenings	5	
	All day	6	
13-14	Hours worked directly with children	Raw score	
15-16	Months worked yearly	Raw score	
17	Adult/child ratio		
	1/2	1	
	1/3	2	
	1/4	3	
	1/5	4	
	1/6	5	
	1/7	6	
	1/8	7	
	1/9	8	
	By state guidelines	9	
18	Hourly wage		
	Less than $3.35	1	
	$3.36-$4.50	2	
	$4.51-$6.00	3	
	$6.01-$7.50	4	
	$7.51+	5	
	Other	6	
	Available Benefits		
19	Paid vacation	yes 1	
		no 2	
20	Sick leave	yes 1	
		no 2	

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
21	Retirement	yes 1 no 2	
22	Yearly bonus	yes 1 no 2	
23	Child care	yes 1 no 2	
24	Health insurance	yes 1 no 2	
25	Life insurance	yes 1 no 2	
26	Comp. Insurance	yes 1 no 2	
	Available benefits		
27	Continuing ed.	yes 1 no 2	
28	Professional	yes 1 no 2	
29	Other	Raw score	
30-31	Total (19-29)	Raw score	
	Used benefits		
32	Paid vacation	yes 1 no 2	
33	Sick leave	yes 1 no 2	
34	Retirement	yes 1 no 2	
35	Yearly bonus	yes 1 no 2	
36	Child care	yes 1 no 2	
37	Health insurance	yes 1 no 2	
38	Life insurance	yes 1 no 2	
39	Comp. insurance	yes 1 no 2	
40	Continuing ed.	yes 1 no 2	
41	Professional	yes 1 no 2	
42	Other	Raw score	
43-44	Total (32-42)	Raw score	
45	Workshop required	yes 1 no 2	
46	Financial support	yes 1 no 2	

Column # CARD # 2	Item Description	Code	Comments
47	Kind of support		
	Money	1	
	Transportation	2	
	Credit for work hrs.	3	
	None	4	
48	Job importance	1-5	
49	Spouse view	1-5	
50	Child view	1-5	
51	Mother view	1-5	
52	Father view	1-5	
53	Child client view	1-5	
54	Parent client view	1-5	
55	Societal view	1-5	
56	Likelihood same job		
	Unlikely	1	
	Not very likely	2	
	Undecided	3	
	Somewhat likely	4	
	Very likely	5	
57	Likelihood of ECE		
	Unlikely	1	
	Not very likely	2	
	Undecided	3	
	Somewhat likely	4	
	Very likely	5	
58	If 4 or 5 on 57	1-5	
	If 1,2,3 on 57	0	
59	Fairly paid		
	Not fairly paid	1	
	Not very fairly paid	2	
	Undecided	3	
	Fairly paid	4	
	Very fairly paid	5	
	Job Pay		*MUST BE RANK-
60	Day care home	1-5*	ORDERED OR ALL
61	Group day care home	1-5*	ANSWERS = 0
62	Day care center	1-5*	
63	Head Start	1-5*	
64	Nursery school	1-5*	
65	Career profile	1-7	
	Job Status		*MUST BE RANK-
66	Day care home	1-5*	ORDERED OR ALL
67	Group day care home	1-5*	ANSWERS = 0
68	Day care center	1-5*	
69	Head Start	1-5*	
70	Nursery school	1-5*	

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
CARD #2			
71	Secretary	1-5	
72	Child care worker	1-5	
73	Nurse	1-5	
74	Receptionist	1-5	
75	Nursery school teacher	1-5	
76	Kindergarten teacher	1-5	
77	Telephone operator	1-5	
78	Bank teller	1-5	
79	Elementary teacher	1-5	
80	Librarian	1-5	
CARD # 3			
1-3	Subject number	001-999	
4	Line number	3	
5	Nursing aide	1-5	
6	Social worker	1-5	
7	Real estate agent	1-5	
8	Computer specialist	1-5	
9	Physician	1-5	
10	Farmer	1-5	
11	Engineer	1-5	
12	Lawyer	1-5	
13	Police officer	1-5	
14	Dentist	1-5	
15	Carpenter	1-5	
16	Truck driver	1-5	
17	Mechanic	1-5	
18	Rancher	1-5	
	Job Value		*MUST BE RANK-ORDERED OR ALL ANSWERS = 0
19	Day care home	1-5*	
20	Group day care home	1-5*	
21	Day care center	1-5*	
22	Head Start	1-5*	
23	Nursery school	1-5*	
24	Perceived success		
	Not successful	1	
	Not very successful	2	
	Undecided	3	
	Somewhat successful	4	
	Very successful	5	
25	Business person		
	yes	1	
	no	2	
26	Professionally employed		
	yes	1	
	no	2	
27	Number of membership	Raw score	

Column #	Item Description	Code	Comments
CARD #3			
28-29	Why work-reason #1		
	Love children	01	
	Good at job	02	
	Societal need	03	
	Personal gratification	04	
	Home with own kids	05	
	Financial reasons	06	
	Nothing else available	07	
	No teaching jobs	08	
	Be own boss	09	
	Need work experience	10	
	Convenient location	11	
	Never boring	12	
	Convenient for family	13	
	Need change	14	
	Bare resume	15	
	Help me when I have my own children	16	
	Keep up with housework	17	
	To educate parents	18	
	To prove I can still work	19	
	Loneliness	20	
30-31	Why work-reason #2	01-20	USE ITEMS FROM 28-29